Symington's Arms Report to Kennedy, P. 3

Warning Against Totalitarian Style Plans in Congress for A "West Point of the Cold War", See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 45 DECEMBER 12, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Jungle Spreads Far Beyond the Congo

In the debate on the Congo before the UN General Assembly, Mr. Aw, the delegate of Mali, expressed views which speak for all the small powers caught in the feud between U.S. and U.S.S.R. "For a long time," he told the Assembly Nov. 21, "the destiny of the Congolese people is not even bothered about by certain delegations that speak a lot about the Congolese problem. The American press and the press of many other Western countries," he continued, "reduce the whole drama to a Lumumba-Kasavubu match, and they say this is the same thing as a Russian-American match. If Mr. Lumumba prevails, they say the Soviet team would have prevailed over the American team. . . . These are the terms in which the Congolese problem is being described to us, and this is the crux of the tragedy. *Once the problem is put in this form all means are good, all blows are fair.*"

Lumumba's Fate Recalls Nagy's

Each of the two great protagonists regards the other as the embodiment of all evil; the word Communism has a Satanic ring on one side, the word Capitalism on the other. If it becomes a question of which is to win, so apocalyptic an end justifies the means on either side. So when the Russians invaded Hungary 24 hours after a declaration of non-intervention, their partisans justified illegality and force on "realistic" grounds of preventing Capitalism from establishing a base in Eastern Europe. The same mentality, though on the other side politically, can now be heard justifying illegality and force in the Congo on the grounds of preventing Communism from establishing a base in the heart of Africa. Lumumba, like Nagy, incurred suspicion by declaring for neutralism. This made him "pro-Communist" in the U.S. press as it made Nagy "pro-capitalist" in the Soviet press. After that his kidnapping and murder by the Russians seemed a minor incident, as Lumumba's will seem to our press should Mobutu execute him now. Indeed editorial writers even on our more civilized papers (see box in next column) have already reacted to his arrest and mistreatment with a barbarity not so unlike those of Lumumba's own native opponents. There is a jungle-like ferocity about the way the great Powers directly or through their partisans hunt down those who dare oppose their will.

Hardly ten weeks have passed since President Eisenhower in his address to the United Nations pledged non-intervention in the internal affairs of the new African States and warned that if the United Nations failed in Africa "the world will be on its way back to . . . power politics, in which small countries will be used as pawns by aggressive major powers." Yet even as he spoke our Embassy in Leopoldville had begun the process of finding us a Congolese Batista in Mobutu and suspending parliamentary government. As in Latin America, we reached instinctively for a military dictator, and fear parliamentary rule lest it prove "unreliable." And the bulk of our press applauded on the premise that anything is justified so long as it is supposedly a question of saving the Congo from Communism.

> **Snips from A Civilized Press**
>
> **"But one thing is clear enough. The struggle between the elements headed by Mr. Kasavubu and those who support Lumumba is not a political contest as we in this country understand such things. It is a grim relentless, unprincipled battle for survival. There will be no winner and loser in the conventional sense. Instead, one will win and the other will be destroyed. In this situation, the United Nations cannot escape reality by invoking lofty phrases. . . . we think the West should welcome the jailing of Mr. Lumumba. Surely that is where he belongs."**
>
> *—Washington Star editorial, Dec. 6*

Most Americans are unwilling to recognize what happened in the Congo. Let us again turn to the speech of the delegate from Mali. "The United Nations Force—let us never forget that," he told the General Assembly, "was called in by a Government which was safely installed. . . . The UN Force has assisted in the illegal dismissal of that government—and then it comes around looking for the locus of legal authority." So long as the United Nations by "non-intervention" and "neutrality" allowed the Belgians to take over first in the secessionist Katanga and more recently at the center in Leopoldville, the U.S. was a strong supporter of the United Nations. But when Dayal reported from the Congo that the Belgians were not only arming and financing the Mobutu regime but egging it on against the UN command, and Hammarskjold demanded that Brussels withdraw its military and civilian advisers we supported the Belgians against the UN, engaging in exactly the policy Mr. Eisenhower so recently condemned, and precipitating the East-West battle now renewed in the Security Council.

The UN command is breaking up: Egypt, Ghana, Ceylon, Yugoslavia and Indonesia are withdrawing their troops. In Belgium, Tshombe of Katanga has been given a medal (see page four) while in the Congo Lumumba will be lucky if unlike Nagy he escapes liquidation. Belgian big business and its Rockefeller partners in Katanga are winning but the price is the loss of emergent Africa's faith in the UN, and the flaring up of the cold war in a new area when the world needs relaxed tension for wider negotiations. The jungle is spreading out from the Congo. *Washington, Dec. 7*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Story of A Totalitarian-Style Measure Francis Walter Blocked Last Summer

Time to Awaken Public to Dangers in Bill for "West Point of the Cold War"

By Benjamin Ginzburg *

On August 30, 1960, in the closing rush of the bob-tailed session of Congress, the United States Senate approved, without a record vote though with some voiced opposition, a bill which would commit our government to fighting Communism by the totalitarian methods of government indoctrination of the people at home and propaganda and subversion abroad. The bill called for the setting up of a Freedom Commission as a propaganda agency and a Freedom Academy which would train at government expense leaders to indoctrinate our people and to carry on political warfare with no holds barred abroad. Passage of the bill in the House was blocked by none other than Francis Walter, Chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, who no doubt detected in the bill a possible challenge to the power and authority of his committee.

Undoubtedly the group behind the bill will try again at the next Congress. Should they succeed in patching up the internal quarrel among witch-hunters—which is quite possible—the bill may go through Congress like a breeze. That is to say, unless the American people are awakened to its implications before it is too late.

Weak-Minded Liberals Joined In

The story behind the bill for the Freedom Academy—the "West Point of political warfare" as *Life* called it—is the story of a group of young busy-bodies in Orlando, Florida, who after talking glibly of the science of counteracting Communism in community and PTA meetings took their idea to New York and won the support of a fantastic array of liberals, right-wing Socialists, McCarthyites, Lovestoneites, Henry-Lucites, and even supposed civil libertarians.

When the bill fathered by this group was first introduced by Congressman Herlong of Florida (in February, 1959) with an editorial send-off from *Life,* I interviewed the Congressman. I could not believe my ears when he told me that the bill had the support of a spectrum ranging all the way from the *New Leader* crowd to Buckley's *National Review* and including, in between, AFL-CIO people and Irving Ferman of the American Civil Liberties Union. He also told me that liberals like Senator Douglas would sponsor the bill in the Senate. I found his statements were only too true.

I tried to stir up opposition to the bill among non-hysterical groups, but everybody thought that the bill would never get to first base—so why worry about it. Actually the plan to hold hearings on it by the Un-American Activities Committee by Senators Mundt and Douglas and referred by clever parliamentary manoeuvering to the Judiciary Committee (instead of to the Foreign Relations Committee) so that it could be handled by Judiciary's Internal Security Subcommittee. The latter quietly arranged a set of hearings without publicity and invited only friends of the bill to testify. The hearings were held in June 1959, but a report was not filed until June 30, 1960—that is to say until what was thought to be the closing days of the 86th Congress. When the Congress was recessed until after the conventions, the bill was put on the calendar and brought on the floor in the closing days of the special session. Senators Young and Fulbright asked why the bill had not been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Dodd replied:

"Of what great moment is it that the bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee instead of to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or the Committee on Government Operations, or the Committee on Foreign Relations?"

And that was the end of the objections; the bill passed.

But for Francis Walter it would as easily have passed the House and we might have found ourselves committed to a government program of subversive activities abroad as well as to Big Brother indoctrination at home.

It does not require much imagination to see how stupid and suicidal to peace a program of political warfare abroad would turn out to be. At home, we need only read the statement of Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, of Huntington, W.Va. (Hearings, pp. 156-9) to understand what types of opinion would be proscribed. Mrs. Payne goes back to the Willard Givens National Education Association report of 1934, which endorsed the New Deal social philosophy, and says that *that* is the Communist-Socialist doctrine we have to attack. "Billions put into buildings and salaries," she writes, "will not reverse the Communist-Socialist trend in education unless and until the curriculum is changed. . . . Yes, we need the Freedom Academy, and we need it now."

Since the counsel and high priest of the Internal Security Subcommittee has laid down the dogma that in eliminating the cancer of Communism we must also cut out "the surrounding pink tissue," (see box above) we can be pretty sure that the graduates and trainees of the so-called Freedom Academy, when they should go back to their home communities to fight Communism, will be no more niggardly than Mrs. Payne in their definitions of Red and Pink.

"Pink" as Well as "Red" Must Be Excised

Mr. [J. G.] SOURWINE [counsel for the Senate Internal Security committee]: Mr. Judd, you spoke of the parallel between an operation for cancer and the attack on the Communist conspiracy. . . . I would like to take this opportunity to ask you: when a surgeon operates for cancer, is he content to remove the cancer or does he consider it important to remove the surrounding pink tissue?

Rep. [Walter H.] JUDD (co-sponsor of S 1689 the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy bill): "Yes, he has to take some normal tissue also if he wants to be sure of getting all the disease process.

—Hearings on S 1689 June 19, 1959.

"In defending itself . . . a democratic country, particularly when it is faced with the sort of challenge we are, would be foolishly naive if it tried to confine itself entirely to open methods. The CIA operates in the covert area. As far as the Freedom Academy is concerned, it would not be operating in that field. . . . But students should understand the covert part of the problem."

—Testimony for S 1689, June 1959.

*** Former Research Director, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, author of "Rededication to Freedom."**

struck a snag, and then the bill was introduced in the Senate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time for Reflection More Important Than Quicker-on-the-Trigger Military Mechanisms

Symington Defense Report to Kennedy Repeats Rockefeller Proposals

The report to Kennedy by Senator Symington on reorganization of the armed forces is a rehash of familiar elements long advocated by the Air Force and earlier embodied in the Rockefeller Bros. report in January, 1958. The new report, like the earlier one, calls for reorganization of the armed forces to create three separate unified commands, one strategic (for massive attack or retaliation), the second tactical (for swift action in so-called brush-fire, i.e. colonial, conflicts) and the third for continental defense.

Symington said this reorganization would save 20 percent or $8 billion a year on the military budget, an estimate not contained in the report itself. This is fantasy. At least the Rockefeller report did not pretend to save money but called for successive annual increases of $3 billion a year "for the next several years."

Sure Cure for A Headache

The new report also repeats the Rockefeller recommendation that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be made "the principal military adviser to the President." In the 1954 Indochinese crisis, the then Chairman, Admiral Radford, a naval aviator, stood with Dulles and Nixon for intervention. The Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Ridgway, won out in his opposition because he not only had direct access to the President but was able to send a mission to Indochina which reported back unfavorably. Intervention was based on glamorous air force delusions. That jungle war could not have been ended from the air but would soon have bogged down into a long and bloody mess on the ground.

The Symington report stresses "the unprecedented strategic value of time." The Indochinese affair shows the importance of time for reflection as a safeguard against the kind of military thinking which believes any problem can be solved if sufficient force is applied to it. This is true only in the sense that a headache may be cured by a bullet through the brain.

The stress on time also appears in the committee's proposal to step up the arms race by ending the practice of "separating the development and production cycle into two parts." Essentially this means that you rush into production before you really have finished development. The report says we waste money by "building weapons which become obsolescent as a result of delay." But often, by *not* rushing into production, money is saved because the new weapon has already been rendered obsolete by a new development. To speed up development is to speed up obsolescence. There is no way out of this rat race except by disarmament. But all this report calls for along that line is "a special assistant to the Secretary of Defense for arms control." "Arms control" is to disarmament what Sanka is to coffee. It is the Pentagon's favorite substitute. Arms race and arms control talks could go on happily side by side.

A Carefully Packed Jury

Kennedy must have known what he would get when he named this committee. At least six of its seven members have been publicly associated with the aviation lobby viewpoint: Roswell L. Gilpatric, a former Under Secretary of the Air Force, was also on the panel which wrote the Rockefeller report; Thomas K. Finletter, once Truman's Secretary of the Air Force, helped write the Air Policy report for a stepped up arms race in 1948; Symington himself another former Air Force Secretary, has been the aviation lobby's main mouthpiece in the Senate; Fowler Hamilton was Symington's counsel in running the airpower investigation several years ago which popularized Air Force views; and Marx Leva was counsel to Secretary of Defense Forrestal. The seventh member, Clark Clifford, was Truman's counsel. This committee, stacked for the Air Force, was hardly an objective body to study reorganization of the armed services.

The London Times Offers the Kennedy Administration Some Foreign Policy Advice

"Negotiations are possible only where the two sides, as systems of states, have a common interest in seeking agreement. . . . The first and most obvious field where the two sides should have a common interest is in ending the arms race. . . .

"At present, the momentum of military invention seems to have its own terrible force, giving impetus to the mounting suspicion which, in turn, give force to the military competition. Whether the United Nations will be able to get the disarmament talks going again is highly doubtful. The truth is that there is no earthly use in comparing rival plans until there is the political will to agree. . . . A summit meeting might clear the air enough for a fresh beginning to be made.

"In the meantime, Britain and the United States have every reason to press on with the talks on the suspension of nuclear tests. History has recorded what happened last time when the loose ends were left, supposedly to be tied up at the summit which did not take place. Failure now would put paid [sic] to the last flicker of hope for general disarmament . . . restart the whole suicidal business of pollution from atomic bomb tests . . . destroy the only likely basis for associating other countries, France first and foremost, in a standstill agreement.

"There are other measures which the West could take without weakening their miltary strength. . . . It must be hoped that Senator Kennedy will keep to his basic view that the small Chinese offshore islands now occupied by Formosa are more bother and danger than they are worth. A useful step might be taken if the United States found that its arms developments had outstripped the need to keep so many bases that were designed for weapons of shorter range. Withdrawals from some of the small and most politically sensitive bases would be direct gain to the alliance.

"Nearer home the developing range of weapons should logically mean that the idea floated by Mr. Macmillan in Moscow could be taken up again. The plan for putting a ceiling on the level of arms on both sides of the border in Central Europe, subject to inspection, still has its political advantages. . . . One objection to General Norstad's latest proposals for putting longer range nuclear weapons into Europe is that they may submerge this idea and thus lose an opportunity to ease tensions in safety. Increased tensions are bound to bring tighter Russian controls in the area where communism sits most uneasily. . . .

"The anomaly of Communist China's exclusion from the UN should be removed."

—The Times (London), Nov. 30, from the second of two unusual "leaders" freshly surveying East-West relations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Signs Point to Surrender on Rules Fight and A Watered Down Democratic Program

News Unfit to Print in the USA: Tshombe Gets Belgian Welcome and Medal

We want to call attention to two dispatches from Brussels on the *Reuters* ticker which we saw nowhere in the U.S. press. The first, dated Dec. 5, said Premier Moise Tshombe of Katanga had arrived in Brussels "to the kind of welcome normally accorded top-flight foreign dignitaries." His party included not only his Foreign Minister but "a Belgian Army major and an African lieutenant." Tshombe was to present a wedding present to King Badouin. "On his departure from Elisabethville," *Reuters* said, "Tshombe was seen off by a crowd of hundreds of persons, mostly Belgians."

A *Reuters* dispatch next day said Belgium's second highest decoration, the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Crown, had been conferred on Tshombe for "heroism" by African Affairs Minister Harold d'Aspremont Lynden. Tshombe, the dispatch said, met the King that day and presented his gift, "a chunk of half-sculptured malachite, described by an official as a symbol of the mineral wealth of Katanga."

Humphrey Sees No Need to Rush

Senator Humphrey upset proponents of the rules changes by giving an interview to the Associated Press (*Washington Star* Dec. 1) in which he said, "I always have been in support of a more effective rule to end filibusters. I see no reason to change my position. But I see no reason to rush this thing at the outset of the new Congress." Humphrey said any real effort to amend Senate Rule 22, which requires a vote of two-thirds present to end debate, should be held off for weeks or even months. The interview was given on the eve of Humphrey's visit to Kennedy; Humphrey is being mentioned for the post of assistant Senate Democratic leader. Three days later Mansfield, who is expected to be majority leader, told the *Washington Star* (Dec. 4) he thinks there will be "a high degree of unity and harmony in the new Congress." The harmony will be obtained (according to a confidential report by Sidney Zagri, Capitol Hill lobbyist of the Teamsters, which leaked to the *Washington Daily News* Dec. 6) by a deal with the Southern conservatives. Minimum wage, school construction and medical care bills will be passed but "with major modifications" to appease the Southerners and to "forestall any fight over the Rules committee." Labor and welfare organizations had better put the heat on. . . .

John Cramer, whose "9 to 4:30" column in the *Washington Daily News* covers news of government workers, published a pathetic letter Dec. 6 from a "cleared" security suspect complaining that despite clearance Government officials and often private employers are afraid to hire him. "The cleared risk," Mr. Cramer commented, "remains guilty—even after proven innocent." . . .

Defeat for the Un-Americans

The Un-American Activities Committee suffered a defeat last week when the Supreme Court refused to hear appeals by the Philadelphia Board of Education from decisions by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ordering the reinstatement of four teachers who were victims of the Committee's 1954 hearings in Philadelphia.

Three teachers, Angelina Intille, Thomas Deacon and Sadie T. Atkinson, pleaded the Fifth; Goldie Watson, the First Amendment, when asked about Communist associations. They were discharged for "incompetency." The State Supreme Court held that invocation of constitutional privileges did not constitute incompentency.

In the Watson case, the State court ruled "that she could not be faulted for a mistaken belief (if such it was) as to what her constitutional rights were under the First amendment. Her appearance before the Committee antedated by more than five years the decision of the Supreme Court in Barenblatt where it was held (five to four) . . . that the First amendment did not justify Barenblatt's refusal to answer questions of the same Congressional committee concerning Communism. . . . Where four of the nine well trained legal minds of the Supreme Court hold to the opinion that the First amendment justified Barenblatt in his refusal to answer . . . surely a person untrained in the law cannot justly be thought to be incompetent for entertaining a like opinion and acting on it."

This recalls the pleadings in the pending Braden and Wilkinson First amendment contempt cases. Both claimed that since they invoked the First before Barenblatt, relying on Watkins, they could not be held "wilfully" to have committed contempt.

Many Thanks for Messages Coming in With Renewals — Please Forgive Inability to Answer Personally

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

12/12/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; 6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED